

# GODDARD SPACE FLIGHT CENTER

## PERFORMANCE EVALUATION PLAN Revision 4

**CONTRACT:** NAS5-98156

**CONTRACTOR:** RAYTHEON STX CORPORATION

**EFFECTIVE DATE:** January 2, 2003

**APPROVAL:**

**Fee Determination Official**

## Table of Contents

<b>Section 1 - Introduction</b>	3
Summary	3
Purpose	3
Scope	3
<b>Section 2 - Organizational Structure for Award Fee Determination</b>	5
Fee Determination Official and Board Participants	5
Fee Determination Official (FDO)	5
Performance Evaluation Board (PEB)	5
Contracting Officer's Technical Representative (COTR)	6
Performance Evaluation Coordinators	6
Contracting Officer (CO)/Contract Specialist (CS)	6
<b>Section 3 - Evaluation Requirements</b>	7
<b>Section 4 - Method for Determining Award Fee</b>	8
Fee Determination	8
<b>Section 5 - Changes in Plan Coverage</b>	10
Right to Make Unilateral Changes	10
Steps to Change Plan Coverage	10
Method for Changing Plan Coverage	10
<b>Attachments</b>	12
ATTACHMENT I. PEB Voting Members	13
ATTACHMENT II. Performance Evaluation Elements and Coordinators	14
ATTACHMENT III-A. Evaluation Periods and Maximum Available Award Fee	16
ATTACHMENT III-B. Performance Evaluation Elements	17
ATTACHMENT III-C. Grading Table	22
ATTACHMENT IV. Overview of Performance Evaluation Process	23
ATTACHMENT V. General Instructions for Performance Coordinators	24
ATTACHMENT VI. General Instructions for the COTR	26
ATTACHMENT VII. General Instructions for the PEB	27
ATTACHMENT VIII. Applicable Form(s)	28

## **Section 1 - Introduction**

### **I. Summary**

Goddard Space Flight Center (GSFC) established the Space Science Data Operations Office (SSDOO) in order to meet the new challenges of introducing cost effective approaches for the acquisition, processing, organization, documentation, archiving, and dissemination of data from many of NASA's space science missions to the world community of scientists and the public. The SSDOO organization is comprised of the Astrophysics Data Facility (ADF), the Space Physics Data Facility (SPDF), the National Space Science Data Center (NSSDC), and the Orbiting Satellites Project (OSP). The ADF and SPDF pursue activities in support of individual spaceflight projects and support discipline-specific, value-added science aspects of the NSSDC. The NSSDC is NASA's long-term archive. OSP is responsible for the project management of GSFC's operating space science missions. The primary categories of SSDOO activities are: the development and operation of mission-specific ground data systems; the archiving and dissemination of public data from most NASA space science missions; and the development and operation of a number of specific, value-added science data systems and services. This contract provides for a full range of support across virtually all activities of the SSDOO.

### **II. Purpose**

The purpose of this Performance Evaluation Plan is to provide criteria to serve as a basis for the periodic evaluation of the Contractor's performance. This plan covers the administration of only the award fee provisions of Contract No. NAS5-98156, dated December 1, 1998. The contract was awarded in accordance with the provisions of RFP5-56013-206. Contract NAS5-98156 consists of two Contract Line Item Numbers (CLINs). CLIN 1 covers Cost-Plus-Incentive-Fee performance based services; CLIN 2 covers Cost-Plus-Award-Fee Level-of-Effort (LOE) services. This performance evaluation plan pertains to the evaluation of CLIN 2 only.

### **III. Scope**

The following topics, among others, are covered in the contract:

The Contractor shall provide the personnel, materials, and facilities except as otherwise provided in this contract to support the SSDOO including the NSSDC. Support includes, but is not limited to, acquisition, ingestion, management, and dissemination of NASA's mission data and related information as well as developing and maintaining, evolving and operating sophisticated computer systems as defined in the contract. The performance of the contract will be evaluated in accordance with this plan. The PEB will then convert the ratings in accordance with Attachment III-C of this plan.

The contract consists of a two-year base period with three additional options of 1 year each. The

period of performance of the basic contract is from December 1, 1998, through, November 30, 2000. The period of performance for Option 1 is from December 1, 2000, through, November 30, 2001. The period of performance for Option 2 is from December 1, 2001, through, November 30, 2002. The period of performance for Option 3 is from December 1, 2002, through, November 30, 2003.

The estimated cost of performing Contract Line Item (CLIN) 2 "Cost-Plus-Award-Fee Level-of-Effort" of this contract \$6,559,046. The maximum award fee for CLIN 2 of this contract is \$458,801. The total estimated cost and maximum award fee for CLIN2 of this contract is \$7,017,847.

The estimated cost of performing option 1 is \$3,414,890. The maximum award fee for option 1 is \$239,384. The total estimated cost and maximum award fee for option 1 is \$3,654,274. The estimated cost of performing option 2 is \$3,495,751. The maximum award fee for option 2 is \$244,703. The total estimated cost and maximum award fee for option 2 is \$3,740,454. The estimated cost of performing option 3 is \$3,550,766. The maximum award fee for option 3 is \$247,843. The total estimated cost and maximum award fee for option 3 is \$3,798,609.

The estimated cost and award fee is subject to equitable adjustments arising from changes or other contract modifications.

The award fee payable for each period will be determined unilaterally by the Fee Determination Official (FDO) in accordance with this plan.

Award fee determinations are not subject to the Disputes clause of this contract.

The FDO may unilaterally change the matters in this plan as covered in Section 5 and not otherwise requiring mutual agreement under the contract provided the Contractor receives notice of the changes prior to the beginning of the evaluation period to which the changes apply.

## **Section 2 - Organizational Structure for Award Fee Determination**

The following organizational structure is established for administering the award fee provisions of the contract:

### **I. Fee Determination Official and Board Participants**

#### **A. Fee Determination Official (FDO)**

The FDO is the Director of Space Sciences. The FDO may designate an alternate FDO when appropriate.

The primary responsibilities of the FDO are:

- 1) Determining the award fee earned and payable for each evaluation period as addressed in Section 4.
- 2) Changing the matters covered in this plan as addressed in Section 5 as appropriate.

#### **B. Performance Evaluation Board (PEB)**

The Chairperson of the PEB and the voting members of the Board are identified on Attachment I. Changes to the Board shall require the approval of the FDO.

The Chairperson may recommend the appointment of non-voting members to assist the Board in performing its functions.

The primary responsibilities of the Board are:

- 1) Conducting periodic evaluations of Contractor performance and the submission of a recommendation to the FDO covering the Board's findings for each evaluation period as addressed in Section 4.
- 2) Considering changes in this plan and recommending those it determines appropriate for adoption by the FDO as addressed in Section 5.

#### **C. Contracting Officer's Technical Representative (COTR)**

The responsibilities of the COTR are:

- 1) Advise the PEB Coordinators of the schedule for the submission of events.
- 2) Receive and analyze the Performance Evaluation Coordinators' Reports.
- 3) Prepare the Contract Performance Summary Report for the PEB.
- 4) Prepare evaluation notebooks for each of the board members.
- 5) Schedule and coordinate the PEB and FDO meetings.
- 6) Prepare FDO correspondence in coordination with the Chair of the PEB.

**D. Performance Evaluation Coordinators**

The Performance Evaluation Coordinators are identified in Attachment II. Changes to this list shall be at the discretion of the Chairperson of the Board and shall not require the approval of the FDO or revision of this plan.

The primary responsibilities of the Performance Evaluation Coordinators are:

- 1) Monitoring, evaluating and assessing Contractor performance in assigned areas.
- 2) Preparing a CPAF Contract Individual Event Report for the PEB (at least semi-annually).
- 3) Meeting with the appropriate Contractor representative as necessary to assure that there are no misconceptions on the contents of the evaluation reports. Performance Evaluation Coordinators should provide written/verbal feedback throughout the period. Both Government and Contractor personnel are encouraged to identify potential problems as promptly as possible (as opposed to withholding such "bad news" until the end of the period).
- 4) Be prepared to make presentations to the PEB when necessary.
- 5) Recommending appropriate changes in this plan for consideration as addressed in Section 5.

**E. Contracting Officer (CO)/Contract Specialist (CS)**

A CO/CS shall be assigned to each PEB. In addition to other responsibilities, the CO/CS shall:

- 1) Advise the PEB on Cost-Plus-Award-Fee rating standards, policies and procedures; and ensure the consistent application of Agency policy in these matters.
- 2) Attend all PEB meetings as a non-voting member; record the findings of the PEB; and assist in preparing all FDO correspondence to the Contractor, in consultation with the COTR and PEB Chairperson.
- 3) Prepare changes to this plan for presentation to the FDO as directed by the PEB in accordance with Section 5.

## **Section 3 - Evaluation Requirements**

A. The applicable evaluation requirements are attached as indicated below:

<u>Requirement</u>	<u>Attachment</u>
Evaluation Periods and Maximum Available Award Fee	III-A
Performance Evaluation Elements	III-B
Grading Table	III-C

The percentage weights indicated in the Attachment III-C grading table are quantifying devices. Their sole purpose is to provide guidance in arriving at a general assessment of the amount of award fee earned. In no way do they imply an arithmetical precision to any judgmental determination of the Contractor's overall performance and amount of award fee earned.

B. An overview of the evaluation process, instructions to the Coordinators, COTR and PEB are attached as follows:

<u>Item</u>	<u>Attachment</u>
Overview of Performance Evaluation Process	IV
General Instructions for Performance Coordinators	V
General Instructions for the COTR	VI
General Instructions for the PEB	VII

## **Section 4 - Method for Determining Award Fee**

### **I. Fee Determination**

A determination of the award fee earned for each evaluation period will be made by the FDO within 45 days after the end of the period. The method to be followed in monitoring, evaluating, and assessing Contractor performance during the period, as well as for determining the award fee earned or paid, is described below.

1. The PEB Chairperson, in consultation with the COTR, will ensure a Performance Evaluation Coordinator is assigned for each performance evaluation factor or sub-factor to be evaluated under the contract. Coordinators will be selected on the basis of their expertise relative to prescribed performance area emphasis. Coordinator assignments may be changed at any time without advance notice to the Contractor.
2. The PEB Chairperson shall ensure that each Coordinator receives the following:
  - a. A copy of this plan along with any changes made in accordance with Section 5.
  - b. Appropriate orientation and guidance.
  - c. Specific instruction applicable to the Coordinator's assigned performance areas.
3. Coordinators will evaluate and assess Contractor performance and discuss the results with the Contractor personnel as appropriate in accordance with the General Instructions for Performance Coordinators, Attachment V, and the specific instructions and guidance furnished by the PEB Chairperson.
4. The COTR shall receive copies of the Coordinator Evaluation Reports and request performance information from other units or personnel normally involved in observing Contractor performance as appropriate. The COTR will be responsible for resolving or documenting the background of any differences between a Goddard report and a Contractor report. The COTR will document the Contractor's overall performance on the Contract Performance Summary Report in accordance with the General Instructions for the COTR, Attachment VI. All members of the PEB shall receive a copy of the report with the Coordinators' reports and the Contractor's Self Evaluation Report (when submitted) no later than 48 hours prior to the PEB meeting.
5. Within 14 calendar days after the end of the evaluation period, the Contractor may submit a "Self-Evaluation" report to the COTR for consideration by the PEB.
6. Semi-annually, the PEB will meet and perform an in-depth review of the Contractor's



Self-Assessment (if provided), the Coordinator Evaluation Reports, the COTR's reports, and other performance information, as appropriate.

7. The PEB shall discuss all the performance information it has obtained, summarize its findings, and prepare recommended ratings for the FDO for each of the evaluation categories.
8. Following the PEB meeting, the COTR, under the direction of the PEB Chairperson, will summarize the PEB's findings in a Contract Performance Summary Report and prepare the FDO's letter to the Contractor.
9. The PEB Chairperson, COTR, CO/CS and other personnel as appropriate shall meet with the FDO to present the findings and recommendation of the PEB. Differences, if any, shall be highlighted. The FDO will consider these and any other pertinent information in determining the amount of award fee earned during the period.

## **Section 5 - Changes in Plan Coverage**

### **I. Right to Make Unilateral Changes**

Any matters covered in this plan not otherwise requiring mutual agreement under the contract may be changed unilaterally by the FDO prior to the beginning of an evaluation period by timely notice to the Contractor in writing. The changes will be made via unilateral modifications to this contract.

### **II. Steps to Change Plan Coverage**

The following is a summary of the principal actions involved in changing plan coverage:

<u>Action</u>	<u>Schedule</u>
PEB considers proposed changes	Ongoing
Changes submitted to CO/CS for drafting	Ongoing
FDO reviews and approves changes	Prior to end of each period
Administrative changes	Ongoing *

\* Administrative changes shall be at the discretion of the Chairperson and/or Contracting Officer and may be made at any time.

### **III. Method for Changing Plan Coverage**

The method to be followed for changing the plan coverage is described below:

1. Personnel involved in the administration of the award fee provisions of the contract are encouraged to recommend plan changes with a view toward changing management emphasis, motivating higher performance levels, or improving the award fee determination process. Recommended changes should be sent to the COTR or CO/CS for consideration by the PEB. The CO/CS shall draft appropriate changes to the plan as instructed by the PEB.
2. Prior to the end of each evaluation period, the PEB will submit its recommended changes, if any, applicable to the next evaluation period for approval by the FDO with appropriate comments and justification.
3. Before the beginning of each evaluation period, the Contracting Officer will notify the

Contractor in writing of any changes to be applied during the next period. If the Contractor is not provided with this notification, or if the notification is not provided before the beginning of the next period, then the existing plan will remain in effect for the next evaluation period, unless the Contractor concurs in writing in making the change effective earlier.

## **Attachments**

## **ATTACHMENT I.      PEB Voting Members**

PEB Members are:

Chair:            James L. Green            (Code 630)    Chief, Space Science Data Operations Office

Members:

Patrick D. Logan            (Code 210.S)    Manager, Space Sciences Procurement  
Office

Steven J. Kempler            (Code 586)    GSFC DAAC Manager

Donald M. Sawyer            (Code 633)    Acting Head, National Space Science Data  
Center & World Data Center A

Robert E. McGuire            (Code 632)    Head, Space Physics Data Facility

Non-Voting Members:

James S. King            (Code 210.S)    Contracting Officer

Roger Dilling            (Code 630)    Contracting Officer's Technical  
Representative

## ATTACHMENT II: Performance Evaluation Elements and Coordinators

<u>Area</u>	<u>Element</u>	<u>Coordinators</u>
<u>Cost Control/Business Management:</u>		James S. King
	Cost Control	CO/CS
	Business Management	CO/CS
	Financial Reporting	CO/CS
	Contract Administration and Compliance	CO/CS
	General Business Management	CO/CS
	Subcontract Management	COTR/CO
<u>Technical Performance and Program Management:</u>		RogerL.Dilling
	Astrophysics Activities	Task Originator(s)
	Space Physics Activities	Task Originator(s)
	Archiving and Information Systems at NSSDC	Task Originator(s)
	Orbiting Satellites Project	Task Originator(s)
	Technical Management	Task Originator(s)

### **Fee Distribution**

<b><u>Area</u></b>		<b><u>% Fee</u></b>
Cost Control/Business Management		40
Cost Control	30	
Business Management	10	
Technical Performance & Program Management		60
Astrophysics Activities	15	
Space Physics Activities	15	
Archiving and Information		
Systems at NSSDC	15	
Technical Management	15	

The performance elements above will be continuously monitored by the CO, COTR, Coordinators and other appropriate personnel who shall provide written and verbal feedback on a regular basis.

At the end of each evaluation period, the coordinators will provide adequate and timely performance evaluation reports to the COTR to allow for the preparation of a Contract Performance Summary Report for presentation to the PEB.

**ATTACHMENT III-A Evaluation Periods and Maximum Available Award  
Fee**

<b><u>Period Number</u></b>	<b><u>Start Date</u></b>	<b><u>End Date</u></b>	<b><u>Max. Avail. Award Fee</u></b>
Period 1	December 1, 1998	May 31, 1999	\$114,700
Period 2	June 1, 1999	November 30, 1999	\$114,700
Period 3	December 1, 1999	May 31, 2000	\$114,700
Period 4	June 1, 2000	November 30, 2000	\$114,701
Period 5	December 1, 2000	May 31, 2001	\$119,692
Period 6	June 1, 2001	November 30, 2001	\$119,692
Period 7	December 1, 2001	May 31, 2002	\$122,352
Period 8	June 1, 2002	November 30, 2002	\$122,351
Period 9	December 1, 2002	May 31, 2003	\$123,922
Period 10	June 1, 2003	November 30, 2003	\$123,921



## **Attachment III-B                      Performance Evaluation Elements**

### **I. Cost Control/Business Management**

#### **Cost Control**

Overall Cost control shall be evaluated on how well the total actual costs were controlled as compared to total negotiated costs. The analysis of negotiated cost control performance will give consideration to changed support requirements, changed statutory requirements, and/or other changes beyond the Contractor's control which impact contract costs. The evaluation shall consider total costs; however, each cost element shall be analyzed to determine its effect on total costs. These elements include (533 report data versus proposed and projected costs):

- i. Comparative analysis of actual contract costs versus negotiated costs as amended to reflect changes in program – explain variance.
- ii. Comparative analysis of actual hours and labor rates versus negotiated hours and labor rates – explain variance
- iii. Comparative analysis of actual other direct costs (ODCs) versus negotiated ODCs – explain variance
- iv. Comparative analysis of actual G&A and overhead rates versus negotiated rates – explain variance.

#### **Business Management**

A. Financial Reporting - The Contractor shall be evaluated on the accuracy of 533 reports. This event will also consider the timeliness and adequacy of monthly and semi-annual financial reports.

B. Contract Administration and Compliance - The Contractor shall be evaluated on the overall administration of the contract. This shall include accuracy and timeliness of all reporting requirements, timeliness of proposal submissions, overall compliance of all terms and conditions of the contract, and responsiveness to contract issues.

C. General Business Management - The Contractor will be evaluated on its local and corporate business management. This area will include an evaluation of the Contractor's overall ability and effectiveness in responding to management issues.

D. Subcontract Management - The Contractor shall be evaluated on the overall

effectiveness of managing subcontracts. This will include the subcontractor's cost performance, the business relationship between the prime and sub, and the level of cooperation between the two parties. The Contractor's performance against the Subcontracting Plan incorporated into the contract will also be evaluated. This evaluation will be based on the most recently submitted SF 294 reporting period. Timely submission of the SF 294 will be evaluated. Technical performance of subcontractors will be evaluated under Technical Performance and Program Management.

E. Health and Safety – The Contractor will be evaluated on compliance with the applicable health and safety clauses in the contract as well as compliance with GSFC health and safety procedures. In addition, the Contractor will be evaluated on providing a safe work environment, maintaining accident/incident files, and timely reporting of mishaps.

## **II. Technical Performance and Program Management**

ASTROPHYSICS ACTIVITIES – The Contractor will be evaluated on the following:

- A. Innovativeness in support of development of the AMASE prototype including automated procedures to extract metadata from active mission data streams.
- B. Effectiveness in developing, maintaining, and operating the XSDC data processing system.
- C. Effectiveness in support of Infrared, Submillimeter, and Radio Astrophysics data management including maintenance of the Web site for access to relevant Project Data Management Plans.
- D. Effectiveness in support of the Ultraviolet and Optical Data Archive including creation and maintenance of data, software, and information archives.
- E. Efficiency in assistance of ASTRO E software development including scientific analysis software, calibration software, and the data processing system.
- F. Effectiveness in the technical management of Astrophysics tasks.

SPACE PHYSICS ACTIVITIES – The Contractor will be evaluated on the following:

- A. The quality of SSDOO interaction with the science communities: demonstrated

innovativeness in design and support of Coordinated Data Analysis Workshops (CDAWs) and distributed collaborative data analysis activities; support of NSSDC role in the operation and further development of the Satellite Situation Center (SSC); assistance of scientific users in the NSSDC capabilities and facilities such as the information system, operational software, and new systems.

B. Supporting new development efforts within SSDOO by providing the “science perspective.” This is especially important for the advanced systems developers.

C. Efficiency in developing and producing value-added products.

D. Innovativeness in supporting magnetospheric modeling and analysis including the development of a new generation of trapped radiation models and appropriate combinations of empirical and theoretical analyses.

E. Efficiency in support of Space Physics Projects including efforts to maintain and upgrade as necessary the Space Physics Data Availability Catalog (both software and database population).

F. Effectiveness in support of Space Physics Data and Information Acquisition and Dissemination including support of data ingest verification and support of data access validation.

G. Effectiveness in the technical management of Space Physics tasks.

ARCHIVING AND INFORMATION SYSTEMS AT NSSDC – The Contractor will be evaluated on the following:

A. Effectiveness in maintaining the System for Information Retrieval and Storage (SIRS) system until its replacement is in place. Effectiveness in supporting the conversion to new information systems.

B. Innovativeness demonstrated in integrating the current NSSDC information and data systems into a unified, effective data management system, and in making accommodations for improving efficiency and hardware/software acquisition, and the ability to stay abreast of current and evolving technologies.

C. Effectiveness in developing and implementing standards for data and information management.

D. Effectiveness in providing support for the NSSDC Standards Office and coordinating

with other elements of the Data Center for the use and implementation of standards.

E. Effectiveness in the use of systems engineering techniques, especially Requirements, Design, and Operational Reviews, in the development of information and data systems.

F. Effectiveness in the programmatic and technical management of the Archiving and Information Systems at NSSDC tasks.

G. Ensuring that NASA's computer systems and data are safe and secure.

TECHNICAL MANAGEMENT – The Contractor will be evaluated on the following:

A. Effectiveness in performing all necessary functions to manage Raytheon STX (RSTX) contract staff supporting the SSDOO.

B. Adherence to the requirement for periodic meetings between the RSTX management team and the SSDOO management team to discuss significant events, and contract highlights, as well as the resolution of contract issues and concerns.

**ATTACHMENT III-C      Grading Table**

<b><u>Adjectival Rating</u></b>	<b><u>Range of Performance Points</u></b>	<b><u>Description</u></b>
Excellent	100-91	Of exceptional merit; exemplary performance in a timely, efficient, and economical manner; very minor (if any) deficiencies with no adverse effect on overall performance.
Very Good	90-81	Very effective performance, fully responsive to contract requirements; contract requirements accomplished in a timely, efficient and economical manner for the most part; only minor deficiencies.
Good	80-71	Effective performance; fully responsive to contract requirements; reportable deficiencies, but with little identifiable effect on overall performance.
Satisfactory	70-61	Meets or slightly exceeds minimum acceptable standards; adequate results; reportable deficiencies with identifiable, but not substantial, effects on overall performance.
Poor/ Unsatisfactory	60-0	Does not meet minimum acceptable standards in one or more areas; remedial action required in one or more areas; deficiencies in one or more areas which adversely affect overall performance.

Any factor/subfactor receiving a grade of poor/unsatisfactory (less than 61) will be assigned zero performance points for purposes of calculating the award fee amount. The Contractor will not be paid any award fee when the total award fee score is APoor/Unsatisfactory (less than 61).

In order to earn a total overall rating of AExcellent, the contract must be under contract cost, on or ahead of schedule for those tasks tied to a schedule, and be rated excellent for Technical Performance.

## **ATTACHMENT IV**

### **Overview of Performance Evaluation Process**

1. Coordinators should meet with Contractor representatives responsible for the factor being evaluated on at least a quarterly basis to review the Coordinator Evaluation Report, discuss performance issues and provide the Contractor with insight into their performance.
2. At the end of each evaluation period, the Contractor's representatives may submit a report of accomplishments to the Coordinator. The report must be submitted within 14 calendar days of the period ending to be considered by the Coordinators in their evaluations.
3. The Coordinator completes the Coordinator Evaluation Report for the evaluation period and hand-delivers the report to the COTR within 21 calendar days of the end of the performance period. Written narratives shall be provided to substantiate the coordinator's scores.
4. The COTR completes the contract performance summary report based on the Coordinator Evaluation Reports. The COTR shall include an evaluation of "cross functional coordination." Cross-functional coordination will consider the Contractors efficiency and effectiveness in balancing priorities between the relevant factors. The report shall be forwarded to the PEB within 30 calendar days of the end of the performance period.
5. The PEB shall meet with the COTR or alternate and the CO/CS to review the Contract Performance Report, consider the integrated performance of the Contractor and develop a recommendation for the FDO.
6. Performance will be evaluated based on a score of 0 to 100 points in accordance with the definitions in Attachment III-C.)

## **ATTACHMENT V. General Instructions for Performance Coordinators**

### **PROCESS FOR PERFORMING EVALUATIONS**

1. Coordinator discussions with Contractor personnel are not to be used as an attempt to instruct, to direct, to supervise, or to control such personnel in the performance of the contract. The role of the Coordinator is to monitor, assess, and evaluate, not to manage the Contractor's effort.
2. Prior to each evaluation period, verify the performance criteria related to the factor being evaluated. Assure that the definitions for each criterion are appropriate for the factor and descriptive of the expected performance. The criteria and definitions must be in line with the requirements and deliverables as described in the applicable sections of the statement of work. Weighting factors should be assigned to indicate the Government's program priorities. The higher the weighting, the more important the performance area or criteria and the more effect it has on the total performance score.
3. Coordinators shall prepare Evaluation Reports as necessary to document performance. This shall be done as a minimum on a semi-annual basis. Coordinators should review the Contractor's performance with the appropriate Contractor representative.
4. Review the draft Coordinator Evaluation Report form with the COTR.
5. Continuously evaluate the performance of the Contractor related to the evaluation factor and criteria assigned to the factor. Continuous Improvement (CI) should always be considered when evaluating the Contractor. Improvements in the combined efficiency and effectiveness of the programs and activities are an ongoing goal. Customer surveys should be considered, where available, in the evaluation of customer satisfaction (recognize that there are multiple levels of customers).
6. Meet as necessary with the Contractor representative to discuss the status of performance.
7. Finalize the Coordinator Evaluation Report within 21 calendar days after the end of the performance period. Steps for finalizing the report are as follows:
  - a. Assess the Contractor's performance in the related factor.
  - b. Written narratives must be provided to substantiate the coordinator's scores.
  - c. Provide written discussion of any additional information that you feel is appropriate.
  - d. Hand deliver the Coordinator Evaluation Report to the COTR, including any Contractor reports of accomplishments.

#### Additional Guidance and Requirements for the Coordinators

- a. Coordinators should plan and carry out on-site assessment visits periodically.
- b. Coordinators will conduct all assessments in an open, objective, and cooperative spirit so that a fair and accurate evaluation is obtained. This will ensure that the Contractor receives accurate and complete information from which to plan improvements in performance. Positive performance accomplishments must be emphasized just as readily as negative ones.
- c. The Coordinator will discuss the assessment with Contractor personnel, as appropriate, noting any observed accomplishments and/or deficiencies. This affords the Contractor an opportunity to clarify possible misunderstandings regarding areas of poor performance and to correct or resolve deficiencies.
- d. Coordinators must remember that contacts and visits with Contractor personnel are to be accomplished within the context of official contractual relationships. Coordinators will avoid any activity or association that might cause, or give the appearance of, a conflict of interest.



## **ATTACHMENT VI. General Instructions for the COTR**

### **PROCESS FOR PERFORMING EVALUATIONS**

1. The COTR will provide support and direction to the Evaluation Coordinators.
2. The COTR will review the draft Coordinator Evaluation Report forms with the Coordinators and assure that the appropriate Contractor representatives have been apprised of the results.
3. Concerns and issues will be resolved or forwarded to the CO/CS.
4. The COTR will continually assess the performance of the Contractor and will verify that the Coordinators are aware of their responsibilities. Continuous Improvement (CI) and quality should always be considered when evaluating the Contractor. Improvements in the combined efficiency and effectiveness of the programs and activities are an ongoing goal. Customer surveys should be considered, where available, in the evaluation of customer satisfaction (recognize that there are multiple levels of customers).
5. The COTR will consolidate the Coordinator Evaluation Report scores on the Contract Performance Summary Report.
6. The COTR shall provide written documentation supporting or contesting all scores on the Coordinator's reports.
7. The COTR will forward his summary, including the Coordinator reports, to the PEB Chair within 30 calendar days of the end of the evaluation period.

## **ATTACHMENT VII. General Instructions for the PEB**

### **PROCESS FOR PERFORMING EVALUATIONS**

1. The PEB shall meet within 35 calendar days of the end of the evaluation period to review the COTR's submission and develop a recommendation for the FDO.
2. The PEB Chairperson, COTR and other personnel as appropriate shall meet with the FDO within 40 calendar days of the end of the evaluation period.
3. The PEB should consider the overall performance of the Contractor. The purpose of the award fee is to reward the Contractor for performing beyond the minimum requirements of the contract.

## **ATTACHMENT VIII**

### **APPLICABLE FORM(S)**